## **REMARKS**

## Summary of the Office Action

Claims 2 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,218,221 to <u>Sah</u>.

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,414,730 to Akamatsu et al.

Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akamatsu et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,528,357 to Dojo et al.

## Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claims 1-5, 7-8, 10 to further define the invention. Claims 2 and 7 have been amended to correct a minor informality. New claims 22-32 have been added. No new matter has been added by this Amendment. Accordingly, claims 1-32 are pending in this application, among which claims 12-21 have been withdrawn from consideration due to a restriction requirement.

## The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

1-WA/2166238.1

Applicants have amended claims 2 and 7 to correct a minor informality. In particular, the article "the" has been replaced with the article "a" in front of the term "width." Applicants respectfully submit that this amendment does not narrow the originally intended scope of the

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 049128-5039

Application No.: 09/994,809

Page 14

claims. In view of the amendment, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection

under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 103 to

the extent the Examiner considers that the rejections still apply to claims 1-11, as amended by

the instant Amendment.

Independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited references. Claim 1, as amended, recites

a combination of elements including the features of "the first drain contact hole penetrating the

two layers," that "the gate insulating film is exposed through the first and second drain contact

holes," and that "the pixel electrode directly contacts the exposed the gate insulating film

through the first and second drain contact holes." None of the cited references, singly or in

combination, teaches or suggests the combination of elements having the above-recited features

of the present invention.

In particular, none of the cited references teaches or suggests at least the above-recited

features of "the first drain contact hole penetrating the two layers." For example, FIGs. 8C-8H

of Sah and FIGs. 2A and 7A of Akamatsu et al. and the corresponding descriptions do not teach

or suggest that the recited first drain contact hole penetrating the two layers (of the drain

electrode). At most, Sah and Akamatsu et al. show that the contact hole formed in the insulating

film is positioned to overlap the edge of what appears to be multi-layered drain electrode. These

references do not show any hole penetrating multiple layers of a multi-layered drain

1-WA/2166238.1

electrode. In other words, Sah and Akamatsu et al. do not show a hole within layers of a multi-

layer drain electrode. Thus, the cited references do not teach or suggest "the drain contact hole

penetrating the two layers" (of the drain electrode), let alone the features that "the gate insulating

film is exposed through the first and second drain contact holes," and "the pixel electrode

directly contacts the exposed the gate insulating film through the first and second drain contact

holes," as recited in claim 1, as amended.

As instructed by MPEP §2131, "a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as

set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art

reference." Further, as instructed by MPEP §2143.03, "to establish prima facie obviousness of a

claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art."

At least because not all of the claim limitations are taught or suggested in the cited

references, independent claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-11 are allowable at least because

of their respective dependencies upon allowable independent claim 1 and for the additional

features they recite.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-11

under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103.

New Claims 22-32 are Allowable

The cited references fail to teach or suggest the feature of "a first drain contact hole

penetrating the two layers and the ohmic contact layer," as recited in independent claim 22, let

1-WA/2166238.1

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 049128-5039

Application No.: 09/994,809

Page 16

alone the features that "the active layer is exposed through the first and second drain contact holes" and "the pixel electrode directly contacts the exposed active layer for the reasons similar to above.

Further, dependent claims 23-32 are allowable at least because of their respective dependencies upon allowable independent claim 22 and for the additional features they recite.

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: 049128-5039

Application No.: 09/994,809

Page 17

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request

reconsideration and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that

there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to

contact Applicants' undersigned representative at 202.739.5660 to expedite prosecution.

**EXCEPT** for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby

authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this

application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required,

including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account 50-

0310. This paragraph is intended to be a CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION

**OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.1 36(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: April 9, 2004

Masao Yoshimura Reg. No. 52,526

CUSTOMER NO. 009629
MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20004
202,739,3000

1-WA/2166238.1